

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1, 4-8 and 10-45 are pending in the application.

No new matter has been added by the amendments made herein, the details of which amendments are described further below.

Claim Amendments

Claim 24 has been amended in order to address a definiteness issue raised in the Interview of June 8, 2006, the interview being summarized below. The cam is now defined to be affixed at the distal end of the camshaft, for which there is antecedent basis in the claim, rather than the exterior end of the camshaft. Claim 1 has been similarly amended.

New claim 45, described in greater detail in the Interview Summary, has been added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 20, 24, 25 and 36 were rejected as being unpatentable over Nelsen *et al.*, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0096889.

As set out in greater detail in the Interview Summary, Nelsen *et al.* does not have a camshaft having a rotation axis coincident with the axis of the gear of the device, and thus does not anticipate any of Applicants' claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 4-8, 10-13, 15, 21-23, 26-35, 37-40, and 43-44 were rejected as being unpatentable over Nelsen *et al.* in view of Erices *et al.*

As set out in greater detail in the Interview Summary, it is not possible to modify Nelsen *et al.* to include a camshaft having a rotation axis coincident with the axis of the gear of the device, as claimed by Applicant, without destroying the camming arrangement provided by the surface of pawl 2 of Nelsen *et al.* The camming movement of the surface of pawl 2 of Nelsen *et al.* is obtained through abutment of entrainment pin 13

against spiral cam surface 15, which requires rotational axes 11 and 30 of the wheel (gear) and pawl (camshaft) to be offset from each other.

As such modification of the teachings of Nelsen *et al.* is not permissible, Applicant respectfully submits that none of the current claims can be held to be obvious in view of Nelsen *et al.* in view of Erices *et al.*, or in view of Nelsen *et al.* in view of any other reference.

Interview Summary

The Examiner is thanked for granting an interview to Applicants' attorney, Alex Porat, on June 8, 2006, at which agreement was reached on the issues discussed, as set out below.

Claim 24 and an independent claim based on claims 1, 4 and 5 were discussed in view of the newly cited reference Nelsen *et al.*, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0096889.

In the outstanding Action, cam (15) of Nelsen *et al.* was described as corresponding to the cam of Applicants' device, which cam has a surface for engaging a latch. The surface for engaging a latch in Nelsen *et al.* is located on pawl 2, illustrated in Figure 1 of Nelsen *et al.* Once this is realized, it becomes apparent that other features of Applicant's claimed device are not present in the device of Nelsen *et al.*, particularly a camshaft having a rotation axis coincident with the axis of the gear of the device. The rotation axis 30 of pawl 2 is offset from the rotational axis 11 of the gear (wheel) 6 of Nelsen *et al.*, conveniently viewed in Figure 1 of Nelsen *et al.*¹

As all of Applicants' claims are for a device that requires there to be a camshaft having a rotation axis coincident with the axis of the gear of the device, none of Applicant's claims is anticipated by Nelsen *et al.*

¹ Applicant notes that Nelsen *et al.* describe wheel axis 11, pawl axis 30 and fork axis 32 as being "coaxial" in paragraph 19 of the cited publication. As can be seen in Figure 1, axes 11 and 30, while parallel to each other, are not and could not be coaxial, as this would preclude spiral cam surface 15 from acting on the pawl's entrainment pin 13 as described throughout the specification of Nelsen *et al.*

- 13 -

The cam surface of Nelsen *et al.* that corresponds to Applicants' claimed cam surface is provided by pawl 2. Pawl 2 is biased inwardly against spiral cam surface 15 through abutment of entrainment pin 13 against cam surface 15. Rotation of the gear (wheel) 6 on which cam surface 15 is located thus results in radial (camming) movement of pawl 2. It is not possible to arrange wheel and pawl and axes 11 and 30 coaxially without destroying this camming action of pawl 2, i.e. it is not possible to modify Nelsen *et al.* to obtain Applicant's invention without destroying this camming action of pawl 2.

Also presented for consideration by the Examiner during the interview was a new independent claim based on claims 1, 4 and 5, presented herein as claim 45. This arrangement, by requiring a helical spring to be located between the tubular mount and the rim of the worm gear of the device, that is by locating the spring "inside the gear" permits a particularly compact arrangement, advantageous in the automotive industry.

Applicant believes that all issues raised in the outstanding action have been addressed, and respectfully request allowance of the application.

In the event that any official wishes to telephone, the call should be directed to the undersigned at (416) 865-8121.

Yours very truly,



John C. Hunt
Registration No. 36,424

July 18, 2006
Date

Torys LLP (Customer No. 33,721)
Suite 3000
79 Wellington Street West
Box 270, TD Centre
Toronto, Ontario
M5K 1N2 Canada